



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/713,625 | 11/13/2003 | Lawrence J. Karr | 50037.0065USD2 | 2408 |
| 27488 | 7590 | 12/14/2007 | | |
| MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) | | | EXAMINER | |
| P.O. BOX 2903 | | | NGUYEN, DUC M | |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903 | | | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2618 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/14/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,625

Applicant(s)

KARR ET AL.

Examiner

Duc M. Nguyen

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19 and 44-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19 and 44-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/29/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 10/29/07. Claims 12-19, 44-55 are now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims **12-19, 44-55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As to claims **12, 44, 50**, the claims recite a "wireless local input interface". However, the claimed "wireless" feature is never described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Accordingly, this is a new subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims **12-17, 19, 44-45, 47, 50-51, 55** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Lorang et al** (US 5,548,814) in view of **Chadwick** (US **5,168,271**).

Regarding claim **12**, **Lorang** discloses a broadcast transmitter (see Fig. 8, base station 200), comprising:

an input-output controller (Fig. 3, ref. 72) coupled to a wireless satellite input interface (see col. 9, lines 50-52 regarding satellite receiver) and to a buffer memory 78 (see Fig. 3 and col. 6, lines 40-58), wherein one skilled in the art would recognize that the base station 200 would comprise components similar to the components of the LAN 38 in order to receive data and re-transmit data to the PDUs;

a control processor (Fig. 3, ref. 72) coupled to said input-output controller and to a local input interface (see col. 9, lines 56-58 regarding connections to PSTN/PDN), wherein it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Lorang** to utilize a wireless connection for eliminating a need of a cable connection;

a precision time base coupled to said control processor (an inherent component in order to provide clock signals to the processors and/or oscillators for operating the transmitter device, see also col. 9, lines 58-67);

an encoding engine coupled to said input-output controller, said control processor, and to a first memory (see Fig. 10 regarding baseband processor components of a Rx/Tx device), wherein one skilled in the art would recognize that the transceiver of the base station 200 would comprise components similar to the transceiver components of the PDU in order to encode data for transmitting encoded data to the PDUs; and

a subcarrier signal generator, coupled to said encoding engine, said control processor, a second memory, and to a subcarrier output (see col. 7, lines 9-11 noting for the Rx/Tx device and see Fig. 10 regarding baseband processor components of the Rx/Tx device).

Here, although **Lorang** is silent with a subcarrier generator, it is noted that since **Lorang** suggests using standard paging FM architecture for the Rx/Tx device's communication mode (see col. 10, lines 53-64), and since the standard paging FM architecture uses FM subcarrier signals for modulation, it is clear that **Lorang** would obviously suggest FM subcarrier signals as disclosed by **Chadwick** (see Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Lorang** to incorporate an encoder and FM subcarrier signals for modulation as taught by **Chadwick**, for utilizing advantages of FM subcarrier communication protocol such as low power transmission.

Regarding claim 13, **Lorang** discloses the control processor includes at least one of a microprocessor, microcontroller, programmable logic array, programmable gate

array, and an ASIC as claimed (see Fig. 10 regarding baseband processor components of the Rx/Tx device).

Regarding claim **14**, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lorang to utilize field-programmable gate array for the input-output controller, for utilizing advantages of the field-programmable gate array such as low cost, fast turn around (i.e, designs can be placed on an FPGA in typically a few minutes).

Regarding claim **15**, **Lorang** discloses the first input interface further comprises at least one of an R5-422 interface, an R5-232 interface, an IEEE-1394 interface, a USB interface, or an Ethernet interface as claimed (see col. 6, lines 60-61).

Regarding claim **16**, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the Ethernet interface as disclosed by Lorang (see col. 6, lines 60-61) could also be used for the second interface (84) as well, for interfacing to the PSTN/PDN network (see col. 7, lines 4-8).

Regarding claim **17**, since the use of 1-ppm oscillator as a precision time base is well known in the art, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lorang to provide a 1-ppm oscillator for the precision time base as claimed, for utilizing advantages of this standard 1-ppm oscillator such as cost.

Regarding claim **19**, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lorang to utilize field-programmable gate array for the modulator, for utilizing advantages of the field-programmable gate array such as

low cost, fast turn around (i.e, designs can be placed on an FPGA in typically a few minutes).

Regarding claim **44**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12 above regarding the FM subcarrier signal generator. In addition, **Lorang** as modified would disclose data source with formatted data (see source PC 48 in Fig. 11 and col. 5, lines 15-21), a mobile device that is configured to receive data in a broadcast mode and a localcast mode (see Fig 11 and col. 12, lines 42-45), and that the FM subcarrier baseband signals is transmitted to the mobile device in accordance with a predetermined schedule (see col. 4, lines 60-62 and col. 5, lines 20-21), such that the mobile device receives the FM subcarrier baseband signals when in the broadcast mode (see Fig 11 and col. 12, lines 42-45).

Regarding claim **45**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 44 above. In addition, as admitted by applicant in [0036], a High-Level Data Link Control (HDLC) protocol is a standardized, bit oriented, switched and non-switches protocol, and can be found in ISO standards such as ISO 3309 or ISO 4335. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lorang to utilize a HDLC protocol as claimed, for utilizing advantages of a standardized protocol such as popularity and cost.

Regarding claim **47**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12 above. In addition, **Lorang** as modified would disclose the encoded data corresponds to an output image resulting from the means for encoding hashing (or interleaving) and

placing packets within a frame received as the formatted data (see **Chadwick**, Fig. 2 and col. 4, line 51 – col. 5, line 6).

Regarding claim **50**, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 48 above. In addition, **Lorang** as modified would disclose commands (i.e, specified time and frequency of the message, see Lorange col. 5, lines 20-21), hashing (or interleaving, see Chadwick, Fig. 2), filtering and amplifying (see Lorange, Fig. 12). As to the claimed limitation regarding the time-diversity stages, it is noted that the use of a transmit diversity is well known in the art (i.e, frequency diversity, space diversity, coded diversity, etc). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lorange to transmit the message with time-diversity stages as claimed, for reducing/minimizing signal reception errors caused by fading.

Regarding claim **51**, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 45 above regarding the HDLC protocol.

Regarding claim **55**, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 50 above. In addition, **Lorang** as modified would disclose the subcarrier signal generator is further arranged to modulate data corresponding to the output image utilizing quadrature phase shift keying (see Chadwick, Fig. 2 regarding DQPSK modulator 130).

5. Claim **18** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Lorang** in view of **Chadwick**, and further in view of **Cox** (US 5,732,333).

Regarding claim **18**, **Lorang** as modified would disclose the subcarrier signal generator is further comprised of a modulator (see modulator 130 in Fig. 2 of Chadwick), and an output filter (see filter 336 in Fig. 10). Although **Lorang** as modified is silent on a digital-analog converter, it is noted that since the modulator data are digital data, it is clear that a digital-analog converter would be needed in order generate a carrier analog signal for RF transmission as disclosed by **Cox** (see D/A 112 in Figs. 1 and 2). Therefore, the claimed imitation regarding a digital-analog converter is made obvious by **Lorang** and **Cox**, in order to generate a carrier analog signal.

6. Claim **46** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Lorang** in view of **Chadwick**, and further in view of **Campana** (US 6,567,397).

Regarding claim **46**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 44 above. In addition, since the use of a wildcard value in the address field to enable deliver of data to a group of receivers is well known in the art as disclosed by **Campana** (see col. 2, lines 60-61), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Lorang** to create an address field corresponding to the formatted data, such that wildcard values inserted into the address field, to enable deliver of data to a group of paging receivers, thereby allow fewer channels to handle multiple broadcast transmitters (i.e, a single channel can be used to broadcast a message to a plurality of receivers).

7. Claims **48-49, 52-53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Lorang** in view of **Chadwick**, and further view of **Weng** (US **4,856,003**).

Regarding claim **48**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 44 above. In addition, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Lorang** to split the formatted data into a first stream and a second stream, interleave bits from the first stream with bits from the second stream into separate segments, and merge the segments in producing the encoded data as disclosed by **Weng** (see col. 2, lines 27-47), for error correction (ECC or Forward-error-correction FEC) purpose.

Regarding claim **49**, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 48 above. In addition, **Lorang** as modified would disclose encoding the formatted data is further arranged to divide the merged segments into predetermined segments wherein in each segment corresponds to a predetermined number of symbols, such that the encoded data is produced (see **Weng**, col. col. 2, lines 27-47).

Regarding claims **52-53**, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 48-49 above.

8. Claim **54** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by **Lorang** in view of **Chadwick**, and further in view of **Misaizu** (US **5,487,089**).

Regarding claim **54**, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 50 above. In addition, since **Lorang** as modified would disclose the subcarrier signal generator is further arranged to modulate data corresponding to the

output image utilizing quadrature phase shift keying (see Chadwick, Fig. 2 regarding DQPSK modulator 130), and since the QPSK modulator that modulates data correspond to symbol by symbol under the transmit clock timing is known in the art as disclosed by **Misaizu** (see col. 8, lines 1-5 and col. 9, lines 1-15), the claimed limitation is made obvious by Chadwick and Misaizu, so that the symbol can be modulated and transmitted in a frame according to transmitting timeslots.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-19, 44-55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See the attached PTO-892.

11. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for **formal** communications intended for entry)

(571)-273-7893 (for informal or **draft** communications).

Application/Control Number:
10/713,625
Art Unit: 2618

Page 11

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner
should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7893,
Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

Or to Nay Muang (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (571) 272-7882.

Duc M. Nguyen, P.E.

Dec 3, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Duc M. Nguyen', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.